

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,555	09/22/2003	Nobuhiro Asada	116957	6173
25944 75	590 09/28/2006		EXAM	INER
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			HUSBAND, SARAH E	
P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	1746	
	•		DATE MAILED: 09/28/2006	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/665,555	ASADA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Sarah E. Husband	1746			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by standard patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUN R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO atute, cause the application to become a	ICATION. I reply be timely filed INTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2 This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ 1 Since this application is in condition for alloclosed in accordance with the practice under	This action is non-final. wance except for formal ma	•			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withen 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-9 are subject to restriction and/or	drawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docum application from the International But * See the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. Itents have been received in oriority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application 			

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1 and 2, drawn to an apparatus with water repellent dispenser, classified in class 68, subclass 12.02.
- II. Claims 3 and 4, drawn to a dry-cleaning machine with cooler, classified in class68, subclass 12.09.
- III. Claims 5-9, drawn to a dry-cleaning machine and filter, classified in class 68, subclass 17F.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I, II and III are directed to related dry-cleaning. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed are separate and distinct, and they do not overlap in scope. The first invention is drawn to controlling the water repellent dispenser based on a response to a signal, the second invention is drawing to a cooling apparatus for recovering solvent and the third invention is directed toward a filtering device. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Art Unit: 1746

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was made to Jesse Collier on 9/22/2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sarah E. Husband whose telephone number is (571) 272-8387. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael E. Barr can be reached on (571) 272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SEH

MICHAEL BARR SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 5